



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,430	07/18/2005	Anthony Spencer	0120-034	5040
42615	7590	03/24/2008		
POTOMAC PATENT GROUP PLLC				EXAMINER
P. O. BOX 270				CHOE, YONG J
FREDERICKSBURG, VA 22404				ART UNIT
				PAPER NUMBER
				2185
		NOTIFICATION DATE		
		03/24/2008		
		DELIVERY MODE		
		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

tammy@ppglaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/534,430	Applicant(s) SPENCER, ANTHONY
	Examiner YONG CHOE	Art Unit 2185

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2007.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 19-38 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 19-38 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/0256/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The examiner acknowledges the applicant's submission of the amendment filed on 12/13/2007. At this point, claim 27 has been amended and claim 38 has been added. Thus, claims 19-38 are pending in the instant application.
2. The objection to the specification has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
3. The objection to claim 27 has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. **Claims 19-38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Steely, Jr. et al. (US Patent No.: US 6088771)** in view of **Dieffenderfer et al. (US Patent No.: US 5822608)**.

Regarding independent claims 19,32,35,37 and 38, Steely discloses a state engine (Fig.2: switch 200) receiving multiple requests from a multiple processor system (Fig.2: multiple processor system) for a shared state (Fig.2: shared memory 150), the state engine (Fig.2: switch 200) comprising at least one state element (Fig.2: arbiter

240) means, said at least one state element (Fig.2: arbiter 240) means adapted to operate, atomically, on said shared state (Fig.2: shared memory 150) in response to a request made by said multiple processor system (Fig.2: multiple processor system) (Fig.2; and col.9, lines 26-51; and col.10, lines 24-54: The switch receives multiple requests from multiple processors for shared memory and arbiter operates the requests received from multiple processors) (Fig.2 and col.6, lines 1-17: the coherence controller 180 and IOP 130 control the arbiter to operate data selected by the arbiter on shared memory through Arb bus 170).

Steely further teaches means to supply data to update said shared state (Fig.1: data is transferred from processors to the shared memory. Thus, the data is supplied to update the shared memory).

However, Steely does not specifically teach the request is made by said parallel processor.

Dieffenderfer teaches teach the request is made by said parallel processor. (Fig.4 and col.12, lines 51-53: Fig.4 illustrates a basic picket configuration of a plurality of parallel processors and memories, picket units, arranged in a row on a single silicon chip as part of a parallel array which may be configured as a SIMD subsystem.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the parallel processor as taught by Dieffenderfer into multiple processor system with shared memory of Steely because each processor may execute a separate program operating on a separate data set (col.1 line 65 – col.2, line 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the parallel processor as taught

by Dieffenderfer with multiple processor system with shared memory of Steely to obtain the invention.

Regarding claim 20, Steely teaches wherein the operation performed by said at least one state element means is a single read-modify-write operation (col.6, lines 29-33: Probes include Forwarded Read (Frd) commands, Forwarded Read Modify commands and invalidate commands. Forwarded-Read-Modify is analogous to the read-write-modify operation).

Regarding claim 21, Steely teaches wherein said shared state comprises a single item of state (Fig.2: single shared memory 150).

Regarding claim 22, Steely teaches wherein said shared state comprises multiple items of state (col.10, lines 31-32: there may be multiple banks of the shared memory).

Regarding claim 23, Steely teaches wherein said state comprises a single storage location or a data structure in storage (Fig.2 and col.5, line 54: A shared data structure 160 is provided).

Regarding claim 24, Steely teaches wherein the operation performed by said at least one state element means is carried out as a fixed or hardwired operation (Fig.2: arbiter is implemented in hardware. Thus the arbiter (i.e., state element means) is carried out as a hardwired operation unless a programmed operation is mentioned).

Regarding claim 25, Steely teaches supplying data to update said shared state (col.4, lines 22-34: arbiter select a request received from multiple processor and update the shared memory).

Regarding claim 26, Steely teaches sending a command and data to said shared state, whereby said operation is programmable (col.1, lines 11-24).

Regarding claim 27, Steely teaches a plurality of said state element means organized into state cell means, whereby operations performed on said shared state are pipelined (see Fig.2 and col.4, lines 22-34: i.e., atomic ordering process).

Regarding claims 28, Steely teaches a plurality of said state cell means, whereby to allow multiple requests to be handled concurrently (col.10, lines 31-33: there may be multiple banks of the shared memory and multiple request queues per processor).

Regarding claim 29, Steely teaches input and output interconnect means providing access to and from said state cell means, a bus interface for said input and output interconnect means, said bus interface interfacing with a system bus and a control unit of a processing element for controlling accesses to said shared state (col.6, lines 61-67 and col.7, lines 1-12: FIG. 2 is a schematic block diagram of the local switch 200 comprising a plurality of ports 202-210, each of which is coupled to a respective processor (P1-P4) 102-108 and IOP 130 via a full-duplex, bi-directional clock forwarded data link. Each port includes a first-in, first-out (FIFO) input and output queue set; that is, each port includes a respective input (request) queue 212-220 for receiving, e.g., a memory reference request issued by its processor, a respective output (probe) queue

222-230 for receiving, e.g., a memory reference probe issued by system control logic associated with the switch, and a respective output (fill) queue 262-270 for receiving, e.g., requested data provided by another processor of the system. An arbiter 240 arbitrates among the input queues to grant access to the Arb bus 170 where the requests are ordered into a memory reference request stream. In the illustrative embodiment, the arbiter selects the requests stored in the input queues for access to the bus in accordance with an arbitration policy, such as a conventional round-robin algorithm).

Regarding claim 30, Steely teaches wherein each said state element means comprises local memory, and each field of a data record is stored in a respective memory of a respective state element means (col.5, lines 54-67).

Regarding claim 31, Dieffenderfer teaches wherein each said state element means comprises a local memory for said shared state, an arithmetic unit adapted to perform the operation on said state in said local memory, and command and control logic to control said operation (col.18, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 33, Dieffenderfer teaches wherein said parallel processor is an array processor (see Fig.4).

Regarding claim 34, Dieffenderfer teaches wherein said array processor is a SIMD processor (Fig.4 and col.12, lines 51-53: Fig.4 illustrates a basic picket configuration of a plurality of parallel processors and memories, picket units, arranged in a row on a single silicon chip as part of a parallel array which may be configured as a SIMD subsystem.).

Regarding claim 37, Dieffenderfer teaches teach a parallel processor implemented on a single silicon chip (Fig.4 and col.12, lines 51-53: Fig.4 illustrates a basic picket configuration of a plurality of parallel processors and memories, picket units, arranged in a row on a single silicon chip as part of a parallel array which may be configured as a SIMD subsystem.).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/13/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

1st Point of Argument

Regarding Applicant's remarks on page 12, the applicants argue that Steely does not teach the state element being adapted to operate atomically on the shared state.

In response, Steely clearly teaches the state element being adapted to operate atomically on the shared state (Fig.2; and col.9, lines 26-51; and col.10, lines 24-54: The switch receives multiple requests from multiple processors for shared memory and arbiter operates the requests received from multiple processors) (Fig.2 and col.6, lines 1-17: the coherence controller 180 and IOP 130 control the arbiter to operate data selected by the arbiter on shared memory through Arb bus 170). While this is unlike applicant's disclosed claim, this reads on broad claimed language.

2nd Point of Argument

In response to applicant's remarks on page 12, that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "the claimed state engine operates on data in a fixed way or a plurality of fixed ways determined by a command word") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

3rd Point of Argument

Regarding Applicant's remarks on page 13, the applicants have added new claim limitation "means to supply data to update said shared state" in newly added claim 38.

In response, Steely clearly teaches means to supply data to update said shared state (Fig.1: data is transferred from processors to the shared memory. Thus, the data is supplied to update the shared memory).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to **Yong Choe** at telephone number **571-270-1053** or email to **yong.choe@uspto.gov**. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am to 5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Sanjiv Shah** can be reached on **571-272-4098**. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PMR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-irect.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

YC

Yong J. Choe

Examiner / Art Unit 2185

/Gary J Portka/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2188